



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

cessors to 1806. The general survey of Frederick's reign lacks those high lights that Delbrück or Meinecke or Marcks throw on any period that they know as well as Koser knew the age of Frederick. The essay on Frederick and the Prussian universities admits, of course, that Frederick was more interested in the Berlin Academy than in higher education. Koser has, nevertheless, made his treatment a history of the Prussian universities in the eighteenth century. How familiar it all sounds! The student body lacks interest in scholarship and needs discipline. The professors are dry and pedantic. Salaries and recruiting from neighboring universities at higher than the regular stipend are burning questions. Professors called from Göttingen to Halle use the negotiations to get an increased salary at Göttingen. And the study of Greek is declining! The longest essay is a survey, based on published material, of Prussian policy from 1786 to 1806. This is a very useful synthesis for those who do not command the mass of special studies on this period. The review of Cavaignac under the title of Prussian Reform Legislation in relation to the French Revolution is a just critique of that author, but in suggesting the continuity of the Prussian reform era with the past, it misses the finer things in the spirit of the two ages. The excellent essay on Frederick William in 1848 is still valuable because of its use of archival material, but is weak as a character-study. The essay on the epochs in the development of the absolute monarchy is a fine example of what history can contribute to political theory and demolishes Roscher's oft-repeated formula. The essay on the beginning of political parties in Prussia before 1849 seems sketchy when compared with the solid work done in this field. The concluding essays on the Rhine provinces and Prussia, and on Louis XIV. (a review of Lavissee), keep to their theme with but little of that nationalism evident in other Prussian historians who have dealt with similar topics. But that little, with its possible bearing on present-day problems, may explain their position at the close of the volume.

The volume fortifies rather than makes a reputation. It is a convenience to have scattered essays brought into easily available form and on paper that is up to pre-war quality.

G. S. FORD.

Histoire de France Contemporaine depuis la Révolution jusqu'à la Paix de 1919. Publiée sous la direction de ERNEST LAVISSEE. Tome I., *La Révolution, 1789-1792.* Par P. SAGNAC. Tome II., *La Révolution, 1792-1799.* Par G. PARISSET. (Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1920. Pp. 440; 439.)

THE decision of M. Lavissee to add to his monumental *Histoire de France* this *Histoire de la France Contemporaine* has brought satisfaction to all lovers of French history. The studies of the last half cen-

tury upon the historical development of modern France have nowhere else been embodied in a view sufficiently comprehensive. The first two volumes certainly offer the best balanced treatment of the French Revolution in existence. The only work comparable is the *Histoire Politique de la Révolution Française* of Professor Aulard, and this is restricted in scope, as its title suggests.

Both Professor Sagnac and Professor Pariset have long been known for their work on the Revolutionary period. Readers of the *Cambridge Modern History* will recall Professor Pariset's chapters on the Consulate and the Empire. Among Professor Sagnac's works the most notable are his *Législation Civile de la Révolution*, his *Chûte de la Royauté*, and his *Rhin Français*. He is also one of the chief collaborators in the publication of documents and studies on the economic history of the Revolution which is renewing the view of the whole subject.

In method both volumes are characterized by the surprising amount of detailed information which the authors give without interrupting the flow of exposition or narrative. There is nothing of the digest, no feeling of pages encumbered with learned minutiae. The opinions of the authors are not obtruded. The facts tell the story, with only enough of interpretation to stimulate the reader's thought. This is perhaps truer of Professor Sagnac's than of Professor Pariset's volume. The most typical case is the former's second book, which has as its theme "L'Oeuvre de l'Assemblée Constituante". Here are skilfully combined reviews of the discussions which resulted in legislation, significant features of the laws themselves, and the experience of different parts of the country with their application. A single sentence here and there gives us a hint of the author's opinion. For example, it is only at the end of the discussion of the early issues of the assignats that Professor Sagnac expresses the view that borrowing "à jet continu au moyen de la planche aux assignats" had "une répercussion funeste sur toute l'économie nationale". The only controversial remark is that the alternative was "la banqueroute générale".

The more difficult problem of organization fell to the lot of Professor Sagnac. Professor Pariset's volume, covering a longer period of time, from September 21, 1792, to December 25, 1799, where the principal theme appears to be political turmoil and foreign war, may more readily follow the chronological order. It is difficult, if not impossible, to treat the great reconstructive work of the Constituent Assembly in this way. Fundamental reforms emerged from committee rooms and were enacted into law often with little reference to the external history of the Revolution. The application of these laws is again something that does not fit readily into a chronological setting. The solution is a topical exposition. Consequently Professor Sagnac's narrative, which concludes in the first book with the events of October

5 and 6, is interrupted by the second book on the Work of the Assembly, and resumed in book III. The fourth book deals with the decline and fall of the monarchy, and the fifth with the first weeks of the Republic and the campaign of Valmy.

The most interesting literary feature of Professor Sagnac's work is his carefully finished portraits of the Revolutionary leaders, especially of Mirabeau, Danton, and Robespierre. Indeed, he has three portraits of Mirabeau, apropos of three distinct phases of his career in the Revolution. Each seems complete without the others, so that in the introductory sentences of the second and third there is a suggestion of repetition. In writing of Danton Professor Sagnac adds a note on the present controversy over the great tribune's alleged corrupt practices, expressing the opinion that as yet the charges are not proved. Although Professor Pariset gives no similar portraits, his conception of Danton is not so favorable, for in mentioning the fact that he had become very rich he adds the remark, "*On ne sait trop comment*". The attitude of the two authors towards Robespierre also differs slightly, but this may be in part the actual difference between the earlier and the later Robespierre. According to the first conception Robespierre the Constituent is hesitant, following rather than anticipating opinion; according to the second "*sa netteté, sa franchise coupante, sa résolution froide*" are the dominant characteristics.

Of the two writers Professor Pariset has, perhaps, had the better opportunity to present fresh interpretations of events and institutions, because investigation for the period of the Convention has not reached the stage of settled judgments to such a degree as for the period of the Constituent Assembly. His treatment of the Centrist party is distinctly new. He ascribes to it a positive policy of great influence, and never represents its members as an oscillating mass now drawn in one direction by Girondin eloquence, and now driven in another by Montagnard threats. Again, he denies that the country was actuated by fear in the summer of 1793. The people, he thinks, put a strong government in power in a mood of patriotic resolution, believing that the treason of Dumouriez and the Vendean insurrection imperilled the Revolution. Two policies were possible, that of Danton, and that of Robespierre—"Ou bien essayer de reconstituer l'unité patriote, ou bien continuer à gouverner avec le parti diminué". The policy of Robespierre was chosen, although that of Danton was in Professor Pariset's opinion more far-seeing, lofty, and humane. He adds, "*La politique de Robespierre a sauvé la France, mais elle a valu la Terreur avec un gouvernement*".

In one respect Professor Pariset's treatment is not so satisfying. He deals in the most summary way with the economic history of the period. The maximum legislation of the fall and winter of 1793 is barely touched. The collapse of paper money in 1796 also receives

slight comment. Another omission is the part in the fierce passions of the Terror taken by the emotions characteristic of a desperate war. This is surprising when we recall that the world has been passing through a similar experience.

Mention should be made of the illustrations, a feature which did not appear in the earlier volumes. They are selected from the incomparable collections of portraits, cartoons, and prints which exist in Paris. In the first volume, for example, are full-page illustrations of the supposed Houdon bust of Mirabeau and an anonymous portrait of Danton. The frontispiece of the second volume is an anonymous portrait of Robespierre.

HENRY E. BOURNE.

Histoire de France Contemporaine (LAVISSE). Tome III., *Le Consulat et l'Empire*. Par G. PARiset. (Paris: Hachette. 1921. Pp. 444.)

M. PARiset is master of his subject, and in this volume, as in its predecessor, has made a distinct contribution to the historiography of the Napoleonic period. The hero-worship of earlier works, from Thiers's *Consulate and Empire* onward, no longer appears. Napoleon often dominates the stage, but many others hold it with him, and interest is focussed on the nation rather than on his fortunes. Neither is there the same respect for the populace of Paris that is so apparent in the work of Aulard and other later French historians. The emphasis is distinctly on the history of the French people as a whole. Further comparison with the work of Aulard brings out the fact that Pariset's treatment is fuller and richer. The former was avowedly concerned with the evolution of political life; the latter is more pragmatic, setting forth not only the political or constitutional changes but also the social organization, population, education, religion, industry, agriculture, and commerce. Foreign affairs could not, of course, be overlooked in the Napoleonic period but it is a far cry from this rather sketchy treatment of the subject to Sorel and others who make the history of France revolve about Napoleon. With Pariset, the imperialist designs of the conqueror receive scant attention. Frenchmen, he declares, did not understand them and became interested in them mainly through their disastrous consequences.

The author is at his best in tracing the development of political and social institutions. Not only is this done with great precision and detail, but for the most part with due regard to their revolutionary beginnings and the hard facts of contemporary life that lay behind them. Too little weight is perhaps given to the Concordat in the revival of Catholicism which the author dates from the 19 Fructidor. Industrial progress on the other hand, he treats too exclusively from the standpoint of Napoleon, forgetting the broad basis laid in the